



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

CK

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,923	08/06/2003	Janet Rossant	MTS2AUSA	8861
270	7590	01/19/2006	EXAMINER	
HOWSON AND HOWSON ONE SPRING HOUSE CORPORATION CENTER BOX 457 321 NORRISTOWN ROAD SPRING HOUSE, PA 19477			LI, QIAN JANICE	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1633		
DATE MAILED: 01/19/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/635,923	ROSSANT ET AL.
	Examiner Q. Janice Li, M.D.	Art Unit 1633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) 1-23 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-32 are pending and subject to the following restriction requirement.

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S. C. 121:
 - I. Claim 1 is drawn to a stable pluripotent trophoblast stem cell line. Classified in class 435, subclass 325.
 - II. Claims 2, 3, 6, are drawn to a trophoblast stem cell. Classified in class 435, subclass 325.
 - III. Claims 4, 5, 6, are drawn to a differentiated cell of the trophoblast lineage. Classified in class 435, subclass 325.
 - IV. Claim 7 is drawn to a trophoblast stem cell with a genetic mutation. Classified in class 435, subclass 455.
 - V. Claim 7 is drawn to a differentiated cell of the trophoblast lineage having a genetic mutation. Classified in class 435, subclass 455.
 - VI. Claims 8-15 are drawn to a method for producing a trophoblast cell line. Classified in class 435, subclass 373.
 - VII. Claims 16-18 are drawn to a method for making a chimeric conceptus. Classified in class 800, subclass 14.
 - VIII. Claims 19-20 are drawn to a chimeric conceptus or placenta. Classified in class 800, subclass 14.

- IX. Claim 21 is drawn to a method for screening potential modulators of trophoblast development using a purified population of trophoblast stem cells. Classified in class 435, subclass 4.
- X. Claim 21 is drawn to a method for screening potential modulators of trophoblast development using a differentiated trophoblast cell lineage. Classified in class 435, subclass 4.
- XI. Claims 22, 23 are drawn to a method for treating a placenta defect using a purified population of trophoblast stem cells. Classified in class 424, subclass 93.1.
- XII. Claims 22, 23 are drawn to a method for treating a placenta defect using a differentiated trophoblast cell lineage. Classified in class 424, subclass 93.1.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons.

Inventions I-V and VIII are independent or distinct inventions. Inventions are distinct if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, each of the groups I-V, VIII listed above is directed to a distinct cell type or tissue/organ, which is recognized in the art as being distinct from one another because of their diverse structures and biological functions. Given the rebuttable presumption that chemical compounds that are not similar in structure are not presumed to function similarly, the claimed products are expected to have different biological properties, modes of action, different effects, and reactive

conditions (MPEP 806.04, 808.01). The different invention groups have a separate status in the art as shown by their different search criteria and classification.

Inventions VI, VII, IX-XII are independent or distinct inventions. Inventions are distinct if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, each of the group listed above is directed to a distinct method for cell culture, drug discovery, genetic modification, or cell therapy. The different methods use different starting materials, have different method steps, assay for different criteria, involve different physiological process, and thus require different search criteria and technical considerations.

The differences of the Inventions I-XII are further underscored by their divergent classification and independent search criteria.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.**

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter and different search criteria, a serious burden is imposed on the Office to

perform a complete search of the defined areas in both the patent and non-patent literature if all the groups are examined together. Therefore, the restriction set forth is proper and not to restrict would impose a serious burden in the examination of this application.

3. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

Groups III, V, X, XII are drawn to numerous species of differentiated trophoblast cell lineages, or methods of using such. Should one of the groups III, V, X, XII be elected, a further Species Restriction to one of the cell lineage is required under 35 U.S.C. 121. Applicant is required to specify one trophoblast cell lineage for examination even though this requirement is traversed.

Groups I-XII are generic to a plurality of disclosed patentably distinct species encompassing cells or conceptus from numerous mammalian species (e.g. claim 11). Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed mammalian species, even though this requirement is traversed.

Different species is structurally and functionally distinct, and not overlapped in structure search. Thus, a search and examination of anything more than one of such together for patentability would be unduly burdensome to the examiner.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is

finally held to be allowable. Currently, all claims are generic, i.e. no single claim is drawn to a particular species of an invention.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is advised that where a single claim encompasses more than one invention as defined above, upon election of an invention for examination, said claim will only be examined to the extent that it reads upon the elected invention.

5. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Q. Janice Li** whose telephone number is 571-272-0730. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 7 p.m., Monday through Friday, except every other Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Dave Nguyen** can be reached on 571-272-0731. The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are **571-273-8300**.

Any inquiry of formal matters can be directed to the patent analyst, **William Phillips**, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0548.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to (571) 272-0547.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance. Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight (EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within 5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

**Q. JANICE LI, M.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER**



Q. Janice Li, M.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1632

QJL
January 17, 2006